

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 6, 10, 19, and 20 have been amended.

## **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because “they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 175.” Applicant has amended the specification to include a description of gasket 175. Applicant notes that gasket 175 shown in Figure 2 is depicted in a similar manner as gasket 210 shown in Figure 3. Applicant respectfully requests removal of this objection.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because “reference characters ‘110’ and ‘130’ have both been used to designate socket (see Page 5, lines 10 and 24).” Applicant submits that references characters 110 and 130 are used to designate separate elements: reference character 110 is used to designate a socket (see, e.g., page 3, lines 6, 9; Figure 2); reference character 130 is used to designate a perimeter of the socket (see, e.g., page 3, lines 9, 26; Figure 2). The paragraph beginning on page 5, line 22 has been amended to correct a typographical error so that the socket is properly referred to using reference character 110. Applicant respectfully requests removal of this objection.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The Office Action states: “the gaps of claim 10 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Applicant’s originally filed specification states on page 5, lines 3-7:

The gasket shown in Figure 3 is formed in four separate segments, which in this case are positioned and sized with gaps between them. The sizes of the allowable intervening gaps will depend upon the frequency and power of the shielded device or devices, the expected field shape or structure, and the amount of desired attenuation of the electromagnetic radiation.

Figure 3 shows the described gaps between segments of gasket 210. For clarification, Applicant has amended Figure 3 to add reference numbers 211 indicating the gaps and amended page 5, line 4 of the specification to include a corresponding reference to “gaps 211”. Applicant respectfully requests removal of this objection.

**35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 10 for clarification. Support for the amendments to claim 10 may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 5, lines 1-9, 23-27. Applicant requests removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

**35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claim 10 for clarification. Applicant submits that Applicant’s specification and drawings would enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the apparatus described in amended claim 10. Applicant requests removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

**35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejections:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,515,861 to Andric et al. (“Andric”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with at least some of these rejections.

The standard for “anticipation” is one of fairly strict identity. To anticipate a claim of a patent, a single prior source must contain all the claimed essential elements.

*Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 U.S.P.Q.81, 91 (Fed.Cir. 1986); *In re Donahue*, 766 F.2d 531, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

Amended claim 1 describes a combination of features including: “the receiving structure including a circuit board and a socket on the circuit board, the socket being configured to receive the electronic device, and the electromagnetic shield including at least portions of each of the heat sink, the socket, and the circuit board.” Support for the amendments may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 3, lines 22 through page 4, line 18, and FIGS. 2-4. Andric does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-described features of claim 1, in combination with the other features of the claim.

Andric states:

The package 114 may be constructed from any suitable material known to the art for this purpose, e.g., a ceramic or an organic material. The package 114 encloses a conductive plane 116, such as a ground plane, (shown in FIG. 1) in a conventional manner to which the heatsink 120 is electrically connected as is discussed further below.

(Andric, column 3, lines 37-42) (emphasis added)

In the illustrated embodiment, a solder ring 155 (see FIG. 1) is formed in the opening 150 to provide the electrical connection between the conductive plane 116 and the heatsink 120.

(Andric, column 4, lines 17-20) (emphasis added)

In the illustrated embodiment, the Faraday cage is defined by the ground plane 116 of the package 114, the bottom surface 125 of the recess 117, and the interior surface 129 of the projecting portion 126.

(Andric, column 5, lines 4-7) (emphasis added)

Andric also states:

In the particular embodiment shown, the IC 110 is shown mounted to a socket 130. Note that the socket 130 is not necessary for the practice of the invention.

(Andric, column 3, lines 17-21)

Andric appears to teach coupling a heatsink to a ground plane of an IC package. Portions of the heatsink and the package ground plane may define a Faraday cage (See, e.g., Andric, FIG. 1). The package may optionally be mounted to a socket. Andric does not appear to teach or suggest a receiving structure including a circuit board and a socket on the circuit board and an electromagnetic shield including at least portions of each of a heat sink, the socket, and the circuit board. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon.

Claims 11, 17, and 19 (as amended) describe combinations of features including: “the electromagnetic shield including at least portions of the heat sink, the conductive skirt, the socket, and the ground plane.” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Andric appears to teach coupling a heatsink to a ground plane of an IC package, by which portions of the heatsink and the package ground plane may define a Faraday cage. Andric does not appear to teach or suggest an electromagnetic shield including at least portions of a heat sink, a conductive skirt, a socket, and a ground plane. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 11, 17, and 19, and the claims dependent thereon.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505\5681-78101\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
Attorney for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800 (voice)  
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: November 4, 2004

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The enclosed two drawing sheets include amendments to Figures 2 and 3. For clarification, gaps between segments of gaskets 175 and 210 have been labeled with reference numbers 176 and 211, respectively. These sheets replace original sheets including Figures 2-4. Figure 4 has not been amended.

**Attachment: Replacement Sheets**